

REMARKS

Summary of Response to Amendment

Claims 55-78 were pending in the above-identified patent application at the time of the Office Action of November 17, 2004. That Office Action required restriction of the application to either the invention of claims 55-71 or the invention of claims 72-78, and also required election between the species of FIGS. 1-4 and the species of FIG. 5.

In a reply filed November 26, 2004, applicants elected the invention of claims 55-71, but inadvertently omitted electing between the two species.* Accordingly, the Examiner, in the Response to Amendment, has again required an election of species.

Applicants' Election

Applicants provisionally elect without traverse, for initial substantive examination in this application, Species 1 -- FIGS. 1-4.

Claims 55-61, 64, 65, 68 and 69 are believed to read on the elected species. The Examiner has taken the position that no claims are generic. However, applicants respectfully submit that at least claims 55-60, 64 and 68 are generic.

Applicants understand that if a generic claim is allowed, a reasonable number of non-elected species, and all claims that read thereon, will be rejoined to the application.

* Applicants also cancelled claims 72-78, and re-filed them in divisional Application No. 10/996,364, filed November 26, 2004.

An early and favorable action is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey H. Ingerman
Reg. No. 31,069
Attorney for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000